96-SSS

GRANTS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES TO 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATIONS, OVERSIGHT, AND RESEARCH

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 7557 and H.R. 7757

JULY 29, 1980

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY
DEC 16 1980
U. S. GOV'T. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 375

Serial No. 96-SSS

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

67-917 O WASHINGTON : 1980

Y4.Ag 8/1:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington, *Chairman*

E DE LA GARZA, Texas
Vice Chairman
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
ED JONES, Tennessee
DAWSON MATHIS, Georgia
GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., California
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi
CHARLES ROSE, North Carolina
FREDERICK W. RICHMOND, New York
RICHARD NOLAN, Minnesota
JIM WEAVER, Oregon
ALVIN BALDUS, Wisconsin
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BERKLEY BEDELL, Iowa
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
FLOYD J. FITHIAN, Indiana
LEON E. PANETTA, California
IKE SKELTON, Missouri
JERRY HUCKABY, Louisiana
DAN GLICKMAN, Kansas
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
CHARLES WHITLEY, North Carolina
TONY COELHO, California
TOM DASCHLE, South Dakota
KENT HANCE, Texas
BERYL ANTHONY, JR., Arkansas
CHARLES W. STENHOLM, Texas

WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
Ranking Minority Member
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
JAMES P. JOHNSON, Colorado
EDWARD R. MADIGAN, Illinois
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
RICHARD KELLY, Florida
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
TOM HAGEDORN, Minnesota
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
RON MARLENEE, Montana
LARRY J. HOPKINS, Kentucky
WILLIAM M. THOMAS, California

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

FOWLER C. WEST, *Staff Director*
ROBERT M. BOR, *Chief Counsel*
JOHN E. HOGAN, *Counsel*
JOHN R. KRAMER, *Special Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATIONS, OVERSIGHT, AND RESEARCH

E DE LA GARZA, Texas, *Chairman*

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., California
FLOYD J. FITHIAN, Indiana
IKE SKELTON, Missouri
DAN GLICKMAN, Kansas
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma

WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 7557, a bill to provide grants to States for the purpose of assisting the colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity for food and agricultural research	3
H.R. 7757, a bill to provide grants to the 1890 land grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity to conduct food and agricultural research	4
de la Garza, Hon. E, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, opening remarks	1
Wampler, Hon. William C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, opening remarks	3
WITNESSES	
Battle, Huey J., professor of economics, Virginia State University	27
Bertrand, Anson R., Director, Science and Education Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture	11
Chisholm, Hon. Shirley, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	4
Halpin, James E., director-at-large, State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the Southern Region; and executive director, Experiment Station Committee on Organizational Policy, Clemson, S.C	37
Mayberry, B. D., director of research, Tuskegee Institute	15
Morrison, Richard David, president, Alabama A. & M. University	34
Simpson, Ocleris, chairman, Association of Research Directors and research director, Prairie View, A. & M. University, Texas	21
MATERIAL SUBMITTED	
Leland, Hon. Mickey, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, prepared statement	39
Agricultural faculty of Tennessee State University, position statement	40

CONTENTS

GRANTS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES TO 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1980

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATIONS,
OVERSIGHT, AND RESEARCH OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. E de la Garza (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Skelton, Wampler, and Heckler.

Staff present: Fowler C. West, staff director; J. Robert Franks, associate counsel; Glenda L. Temple, clerk; Thomas E. Adams, Bernard Brenner, Anita R. Brown, Mario Castillo, Kathleen Garvin, and Gerald R. Jorgensen.

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. E DE LA GARZA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The subcommittee will be in order.

We meet this morning to consider H.R. 7557 and other related matters pertaining to this legislation.

The Civil War, from April 1861 to April 1865, was the single most important factor leading to the creation of conditions favorable to the establishment, growth, and development of educational institutions for the Negro in the Southern States. The end of the war marked the close of a 244-year era, from 1619 to 1863, during which the Negro was held in slavery, an era in which it was considered a criminal offense to instruct the Negro in any but the most rudimentary of domestic skills.

In 1862, the U.S. Congress passed the first Morrill Act, which provided for the establishment of a land-grant institution in each State to educate citizens in the fields of agriculture, home economics, the mechanical arts, and other useful professions. In the South, under the premise of legal separation of the races, the Negro was not permitted to attend the institutions first established under the Morrill Act of 1862.

Although the law did provide for separate but equal facilities, only Mississippi and Kentucky established institutions for Negroes under the first Morrill Act, and only Alcorn University was designated as land-grant.

Even with the enactment of the Morrill Act of 1862 the Federal Government was unable to gain cooperation from the Southern States in the provision of land-grant support to Negro institutions.

To overcome this problem a second Morrill Act was passed in 1890 specifically to support the Negro land-grant institutions.

Thus, the Negro land-grant institutions are referred to today as the 1890 institutions. Those Southern States which did not have Negro institutions by 1890 each established one later under this act.

Tuskegee Institute was created by an act of the Alabama Legislature. However, 12 years later the State established and incorporated a board of trustees and named the school private. Therefore, it is not a land-grant college in spite of the fact that it was granted 25,000 acres of land by the U.S. Congress in 1899.

The 1890 institutions and Tuskegee Institute undertook a study of agriculture research facilities to determine what was needed to make their facilities comparable to those of other State and Federal agricultural laboratories. It is the intent of the USDA to distribute the funds appropriated over a 5-year period with the States financing one-half of the total cost.

The $48 million proposal provides 1-year catchup funding for research facilities at 1890 institutions. This will be an important contribution to improve equal opportunities for research, teaching, and extension denied to the 17 schools because of inadequate State funding and little or no Federal funding in the past.

The colleges were asked by the USDA to submit figures for the kind of thing they would use Federal funds for in order to conduct their needed research. Therefore, we are here today to consider legislation for their benefit.

My bill provides, in accordance with the President's fiscal year 1981 budget and Appropriations Committee language, for: One, grants to 1890 institutions for the purpose of assisting the institutions in the purchase of equipment and land and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings; two, States mandatory matching of the Federal funds with an equivalent amount of non-Federal funds; three, authorization of Federal appropriations for fiscal year 1981 through 1985 in the amount of $5 million per year; four, sums appropriated remaining available until expended; five, that 4 percent of the funds to be appropriated will be utilized by USDA for administration of the program; and, six, that no Federal funds provided by this bill may be used for the payment of any overhead costs of the eligible institutions.

The 1890 institutions and the year of their pending are: Lincoln University, 1866; Alcorn State University, 1871; South Carolina State College, 1972; University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff, 1973; Alabama A. & M. University, 1876; Southern University, 1880; Tuskegee Institute, 1881; Virginia State College, 1882; Kentucky State University, 1886; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, 1886; Florida A. & M. University, 1887; Delaware State College, 1891; North Carolina A. & T. University, 1891; Fort Valley State College, 1895; Langston University, 1897; and Tennessee State University, 1909.

This legislation has been too long in coming and it is but a small step. Nevertheless, it is a positive step.

I am proud to be a part of this effort. Therefore, I introduce H.R. 7557—legislation to provide grants to the States for the purpose of assisting the colleges eligible to receive funds under the act of

August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity for food and agriculture research.

Mr. Wampler, do you have a statement to make?

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding hearings on the bills H.R. 7557, which you introduced, and H.R. 7757, which I introduced. Both of the bills are designed to provide Federal grant funds for the construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment at our 1890 land-grant institutions and Tuskegee Institute.

The two pieces of legislation differ in that H.R. 7557 would make these grants based on facility needs data supplied by the affected institutions several years ago, while my bill, which was introduced at the request of the Virginia State University, would follow traditional formula funding procedures already set forth for research and extension grants for the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee in title XIV of the 1977 farm bill. The witnesses we are about to hear can spell the whole issue out in this regard better than I can.

Mr. Chairman, the allocation methods established in both of these bills have merits and drawbacks. As I indicated to you in my letter of July 3, I am certain that a compromise can be reached which will permit a mutual attainment of this most worthwhile goal.

Thank you.

[The bills, H.R. 7557 and H.R. 7757, follow:]

[H.R. 7557, 96th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To provide grants to States for the purpose of assisting the colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity for food and agricultural research.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress to assist, on a matching basis, the States having institutions eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417-419, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee Institute, in providing for the acquisition and improvement of research facilities and equipment for these institutions so that they may participate fully with the State agricultural experiment stations in a balanced attack on the research needs of the people of their States.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "eligible institution" means institutions eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417-419, as amended; 7 U.S.C 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee Institute, commonly known as 1890 land-grant colleges; and

(b) the term "States" means those States in which eligible institutions are located.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1981 through 1985, such sums to remain available until expended.

Sec. 4. Four per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available to the Secretary for administration of this grants program. The remaining funds shall be available for grants to the States for the purpose of assisting eligible institutions in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen the capacity of the institutions to conduct food and agricultural research.

Sec. 5. Grants awarded pursuant to this Act shall be made in such amounts and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine necessary for

READEX FICHE

carrying out the purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That each grant awarded under this Act shall require that the Federal contribution be matched by an equivalent amount of State funds for purposes of carrying out the grant agreement.

Sec. 6. Federal funds provided under this Act may not be utilized for the payment of any overhead costs of the eligible institutions.

Sec. 7. It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the provisions of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

[H.R. 7757, 96th Cong. 2d sess.]

A BILL To provide grants to the 1890 land grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity to conduct food and agricultural research.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress to assist the 1890 land grant colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, in providing for the acquisition and improvement of research facilities and equipment so that they may participate fully with the State agricultural experimental stations in meeting the agricultural research needs of the people of their States.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) "eligible institutions" means an institution eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1980 (26 Stat. 417–419, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328), including Tuskegee Institute, commonly known as the 1890 land grant colleges;

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1982 through 1986 for the purpose of making grants to eligible institutions for the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, or renovation of buildings to strengthen the capacity of eligible institutions to conduct food and agricultural research, but not including the payment of any overhead costs of the eligible institutions, such sums to remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. The funds appropriated in each fiscal year under this Act shall be distributed as follows:

(a) Four per centum shall be available to the Secretary for administration of this Act.

(b) The remainder shall be allotted among the eligible institutions as follows: of funds in excess of the amount allocated under subsection (a) of this section; 20 per centum shall be allotted among eligible institutions in equal proportions; 40 per centum shall be allotted among the eligible institutions in the proportion that the rural population of the State in which each eligible instition is located bears to the total rural population of all the States in which eligible institutions are located, as determined by the last preceding decennial census; and the balance shall be allotted among the eligible institutions in the proportion that the farm population of the State in which each eligible institution is located bears to the total farm population of all the States in which the eligible institutions are located, as determined by the last preceding decennial census. In computing the distribution of funds allocated under this subsection, the allotments to Tuskegee Institute and Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University shall be determined as if each institution were in a separate State.

SEC. 5. Grants awarded pursuant to this act shall be made in such amounts and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the provisions of this Act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe as necessary therefor.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The first witness this morning is a distinguished colleague of ours, a Member of Congress from New York, the Honorable Shirley Chisholm.

We welcome you, Mrs. Chisholm, and would be very happy to hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to appear before this subcommittee to discuss research improvements for the black land-grant institutions.

As the chairman knows, the Agriculture Committee was my first committee assignment as a freshman Member. Although my membership on the Agriculture Committee was short-lived, I am always happy to have the opportunity to address the members of this committee.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 7557, I am very pleased that the chairman has scheduled these hearings. As the committee is aware, while several historically black colleges became land-grant institutions through congressional action in 1890, these institutions have never received the kind of programmatic support available to other land-grant institutions.

Consequently, the 1890 institutions as well as Tuskegee Institute have lacked the equipment and the facilities that would enable them to have a competitive research capability in the areas of food and agriculture.

The colleges covered in H.R. 7557 have many of the problems which exist in black colleges generally—limited academic programs and small staffs. In today's world of expanding educational opportunities many young black professors, particularly in the science and research field, are not restricted to black colleges as their only source of employment.

Increasingly, blacks in scientific fields are being sought after by large research corporations or large white universities with established laboratories and facilities. It is very difficult for black colleges like the 1890 institutions, to compete for this research talent when they lack adequate research facilities, or if fiscal constraints force faculty members to carry heavy teaching loads leaving little or no time to develop research projects.

The 1890 institutions face a particularly difficult burden in this situation, since one of their mandates is to provide research in agriculture which will benefit the needs of the people in their States. The 1890 schools, as with most black colleges, have been making do with their very limited resources.

In fact, the total resources received by all black colleges from the Department of Agriculture in 1979 was only $28 million in comparison to $430 million received by all institutions. This is an actual reduction in support from 7.6 percent of the Agriculture Department's total budgetary support for black colleges in 1978 to 6.5 percent in 1979.

If these land-grant schools are to be full partners with the 1862 land-grant schools, then we need to take a serious look at the present research needs and whether H.R. 7557 as presently drafted is adequate to address the needs of these schools.

In the assessment of the needs of the 17 1890 institutions the Association of Research Directors conducted a critical study of each institution's facility needs. The results of this study indicated that of the total requests for office and laboratory space, only $2.7 million was for renovation, while $24.3 was needed for new construction.

Support facilities for livestock research totaled $11 million. Land, greenhouses, and machinery for crop research required an addi-

67-917 O - 80 - 2

tional $7 million, and miscellaneous land needs required an additional $3 million.

One might then ask why the administration's legislative proposal only authorizes $25 million with a requirement for matching funds from the States.

In a year when Congress is being pressured to balance the budget, it is not surprising that the original proposal of $50 million for the 1890 schools has been halved. The reality of such a reduction, however, should be carefully considered.

With 17 potential participants, each college would average less than $1.5 million in support. There are only three schools with facility needs of less than $1 million.

There are very few, if any, research projects that can be developed for less than $2 million. Equipment and renovation of facilities alone, without additional staff costs, would be in excess of the amount most of these colleges would receive under the administration's proposals.

In fact, only five colleges would receive sufficient grants under this proposal to make significant improvements in their research facilities. An important word here is "significant."

If colleges receive an adequate grant for their research needs, most of these funds will probably be used for additional staffing without making the necessary equipment purchases and facility renovations which are needed to help equalize these colleges with the 1862 land-grant institutions.

Further, to require that the States match Federal dollars for these institutions is an additional hurdle that many of these schools may never overcome. The State legislatures and the State agriculture departments have a long, protracted history of ignoring the needs of these institutions in favor of historically white State colleges and universities. The record speaks for itself.

For example, as recently as 1975, in a debate over which State campus should develop a veterinary school, North Carolina decided to build the school at North Carolina State rather than at North Carolina A. & T., a traditionally black college.

In addition, the 1890 colleges were not eligible to participate in the Federal facilities program provided in the late 1960's and the early 1970's for the 1862 land-grant institutions under the Research Facilities Act of 1963.

Admittedly, assistance to these schools is long overdue. However, we would only further handicap these institutions if we insisted that the schools would only receive Federal support if they obtain a State match. It is important to remember that these schools have a long history of discrimination and neglect by their State governments.

We have to remember that black State colleges, many of which are close to 100 years old, existed under the separate but equal doctrine of segregation. Many land-grant institutions may in fact feel that this legislation will take away their almost exclusive domination of agricultural research and will hence begin expensive lobbying efforts to prevent State legislatures from appropriating the necessary Federal funds.

Further, the 1890 institutions could easily file charges that there is no need for additional funds, since the 1862 institutions already

have the necessary physical plants and these funds would only serve to duplicate existing programs.

I do not wish to cast aspersions upon this legislation, but I do feel that if we truly wish to assist these colleges we must carefully examine the impact of any legislative initiative to assist them.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 7557, I would urge this subcommittee to investigate whether potential problems do exist for 1890 institutions in obtaining State matching funds.

I, personally, suspect that the majority of the 1890 institutions would be unable to obtain the necessary State support to participate in this Agriculture Department program, only because of the history of these institutions in the various States.

In addition, I am sure that this subcommittee is all too aware of the pressures on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, so I can understand the rationale for limiting the authorization level. I view the matching requirement as a more serious impediment to those schools' ability to enhance their agricultural research facilities than a reduction in overall funding support.

Despite these potential problems, I want to express that this type of legislation is overdue. The 1890 institutions have existed under a separate and unequal doctrine for far too long.

I feel that you, Mr. Chairman, should be commended for your efforts to begin to attempt to rectify this inequity. I want to assure you that I stand ready to offer my support to your efforts to bring this legislation before the House during these last days of the 96th Congress.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts and my views with you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Mrs. Chisholm. Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Chisholm, I just want to thank you for taking time to come and share with us your views on this legislation and the general plight of the so-called 1890 institutions and Tuskegee.

I would just like to make the observation that you are quite correct when you say that we have failed miserably, I think, in the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the mission of the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee.

This is also true of our traditional land-grant colleges and universities. As you will recall, when Congress debated the 1977 farm bill, included in that was title XIV which, I think, reestablished the congressional intent concerning that mission.

Recognizing that we have had fiscal restraints in many programs which, you and I agree, are of high priority, I just want to assure you that it is the intention of this committee, being the authorizing committee, to do everything that we can to reach these reasonable goals of appropriations so that in fact the 1890's and Tuskegee can carry out the mission that Congress intended.

I quite agree with you too that some of the States have not been as sensitive or as responsive in these areas as they should have been. While we are primarily concerned with the Federal part of the partnership, there is no reason why we should not insist that the States carry out their fair share of it so that we can see the full

utilization of this tremendous resource. A potential is there that has not been fully developed, in my opinion.

I hope that we can count on your continued support, particularly when we get into the assessment of priorities, so that we can at least see that the 1890's and Tuskegee are given sufficient funds to carry out what I am sure they want to do, need to do, and have the capability of doing.

Thank you so much for your appearance here today.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Skelton?

Mr. SKELTON. Representative Chisholm, thank you for your testimony.

I got here a little late and did not get the full gist of it, so would you help clarify this for me: You are speaking about the 1890 land-grant colleges that were authorized, I assume, under a law passed in 1890. I kept hearing the phrase "the 1890 institutions plus Tuskegee." Explain to me why you used that phrase, or is Tuskegee one of the land-grant colleges?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Tuskegee was brought in around 1899, I believe, and traditionally we have had about 17 black land-grant colleges which have never been able to participate in many of the grants and fundings that have moved on the national legislative levels for all kinds of reasons.

We have found that historically the States—although not all of them but some—have practiced a policy of educational benign neglect toward the black land-grant institutions.

I am not saying that this legislation will be a panacea for all of the ills, deficiencies, and problems, but it is a beginning in that it realizes that if these black land-grant institutions are going to carry out their mandate, we have to give to them the kind of programmatic and resources support that they need.

Mr. SKELTON. I take it that the initial land-grant institutions go back to 1862. Is that not correct?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Yes.

Mr. SKELTON. Explain to me why they are favored, either legally or otherwise, as of this moment.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. As I said in my testimony—and I think you know—historically the black land-grant institutions and most black State colleges have existed under the separate but equal doctrine of segregation. I think it has something to do with the historical, economic, and social developments in the different regions of our country.

Now that we are coming to a point in time when the dynamisms of the country and the social, societal, and economic changes and the competitions exist among colleges and universities——

Mr. SKELTON. For these research moneys and grants.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. That is right, for research grants. We have to really take a very serious look at the fact of the separate but unequal doctrine and the situation in which it places the black land-grant colleges and Tuskegee. I would consider that they are placed in rather vulnerable positions, particularly when you look at the fact that the economic condition in this country today is such that everyone is attempting to get a piece of the action or of whatever is left in the pot.

I think that we have to realize that agriculture is big business.

Mr. SKELTON. Yes; we agree with that.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. When we attempt to bring the black land-grant colleges into this competition so that they will be treated in a more equitable fashion, we have to be cognizant of the fact that those who have been the beneficiaries of the status quo might begin some extensive lobbying efforts to undercut and minimize——

Mr. SKELTON. Obviously, they have an advantage in lobbying.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Of course.

Mr. SKELTON. We are attempting to assist this particular group that was authorized under the 1890 law. I am sure that historically what you say can be backed up with facts and figures, probably for each one of them. I am sure of that. Is that not correct?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Yes; that is the general situation.

Mr. SKELTON. You are a very capable spokeswoman. I thank you so much.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA Mrs. Chisholm, I would like to comment on something very briefly. In your statement you mention that only five colleges would receive sufficient grants under this proposal, et cetera.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. On what page is that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It is on page 3. I do not know to what extent you are privy to the history of this legislation. The fact is that all of the institutions were asked to submit figures which they felt reflected their needs at the time, and which they felt they could handle and would be appropriate within their overall program.

The figures on which we based the legislation or the formula we used stems from that. There is no per capita or formula that would give outright to each institution.

The history is that it was the institutions that said, "These are our priorities and this is what we need." Hence, that is why five get more than the others do. The institutions, their presidents, and their boards stated that that was——

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Let me say this. I think it was OMB that did come up with the matching requirement.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I am not talking about matching. What I want to clarify is that if one institution gets more than another, it is because this is what they said they needed.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I would have to go back and check on my research and statistics. I recognize that in terms of laboratory space, greenhouses, land space, and the need for attracting the kind of staff that is necessary to do the effective, relevant jobs in this area, that we may disagree.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. This is a factual situation, not a wish list.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Let me go back and check and share my thoughts with you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not know that there is any great discrepancy. I just wanted to make that comment for the record.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Certainly.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. They came up with the figures. Also, somewhere down the line you have to make a judgment on equality. The other institutions have the matching provision. All we are trying to do is to move these institutions into the mainstream. You cannot have exceptions down the line.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I understand.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I am sure you have supported by facts and figures the indictment of the State legislatures in the several States for their lack of assistance to these institutions with which no one could quarrel historically or factually.

My concern is that I think that this Member, particularly and personally, in his own district feels somewhat impatient at times that now everything is a Federal problem. The indictment per se of a local institution always yields the statement: "Let the Federal Government do it."

I think our pressure should be toward the responsibility lying back there and that it should be exercised, and these institutions and their supporters should continue insisting to the local legislatures. We, in the Federal Establishment, should continue insisting that it is a partnership and that the solution should not be: "Well, since the fellows down there in the State legislatures did not do it," we pass it off without any public indictment for their lack of interest and feel that it can all somehow be corrected here in Washington.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. May I react.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes; of course.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I would only say that I agree wholeheartedly with what you are saying. If we could depend on the morality and the power that is vested in our State government subdivisions, and if we could expect them to do the job that they are supposed to do, it would be another matter. Sometimes it might seem to people unjustified to resort to the last recourse that we have; namely, the Federal Government. The Federal Government oversees all the people in this country.

What I find is that if we were able to constantly monitor and supervise the local subdivisions in terms of making sure that there is equal treatment across the board, we would not even have to come to the Federal Government for some of the things that we are forced to ask for.

I always remember, Mr. Chairman, that so many people became so concerned when they thought that the Federal Government was becoming involved in States rights, yet we know historically that if the Federal Government did not become involved in States rights with respect to the black persons of this country with respect to their voting, public accommodation, and what have you, perhaps we would not have achieved anything. It was the Federal Government that provided the essential moral leadership.

We cannot depend on the morality of lots of local subdivisions to do what is right. Basically, I think we should not have to come here, but human beings being what they are, we have found that this is the last place to which we could come.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I agree with you. We do not differ in our philosophies. What I am trying to say is that perhaps, because of my personal situation, if a meteor falls on Upshur County, Tex., immediately they feel that the Federal Government should come and take care of it, never having gone to the local institutions or to the State first—sometimes it gets frustrating.

Eventually, if it is not done locally, it becomes your and my fault that it was not done, without any chastisement of the local institutions and their officeholders.

The bottom line of your statement is the bottom line of anything that I would say; namely, that this is long overdue. We need to work together to make it come about, whatever end result we get.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Our next witness represents the Science and Education Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We have its Director, Mr. Anson Bertrand, who is accompanied by Dr. McKinley Mayes, coordinator of 1890 programs.

We will be happy to hear from you at this time. We welcome you.

STATEMENT OF DR. ANSON R. BERTRAND, DIRECTOR, SCIENCE AND EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. McKINLEY MAYES, COORDINATOR, 1890 PROGRAMS

Dr. BERTRAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a privilege to appear before the committee on behalf of the Science and Education Administration, or SEA, to testify in favor of H.R. 7557, sponsored by Chairman de la Garza. I am accompanied by Dr. McKinley Mayes, coordinator of 1890 programs in SEA.

First, let me express my appreciation to this committee for its concern and far-sighted leadership in recognizing the facilities needs of the 1890 land-grant institutions, including Tuskegee Institute.

The enactment of H.R. 7557 is recommended in the President's fiscal year 1981 budget. This bill is intended to provide modern facilities for federally supported research and to stimulate the infusion of State funds into the agricultural research activities of these predominantly minority institutions to permit their full participation in well coordinated agricultural research in their States and regions.

H.R. 7557 authorizes grants to the States for funding of food and agriculture research facilities for the 1890 land-grant institutions including Tuskegee Institute. This would be a 5-year authorization of appropriations to remain available until expended. The legislation would require the States to match the Federal funds awarded with an equivalent amount of non-Federal funds.

H.R. 7557 authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1981 through 1985 at the rate of $5 million per year, for a total Federal program of $25 million, to be matched in State funds.

Four percent of the funds to be appropriated will be used by the Department to administer the program. Grants awarded for facilities shall be made in such amounts and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine necessary for carrying out the purposes of the act.

The construction would be conducted through contractual arrangements that are consistent with State laws and regulations and with university policy and regulations at the 17 institutions. The Federal funding will approximate 50 percent of the facilities need of each institution. The Department intends to distribute the

funds appropriated over a 5-year period as shown on the attachment to my testimony.

The introduction of this bill represents the culmination of several years of work. Research facilities needs were identified in a concerted study initiated by the 1890 institutions including Tuskegee in 1976. The study was updated and made a component of a Department study of research facilities required by section 1462 of the National Agriculture Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, or Public Law 95–113.

Each institution conducted a study of its facility needs, taking into account: Upgrading facilities to make office and laboratory space comparable to that in other State and Federal agricultural research laboratories, eliminating the encroachment of current research activities on resident instruction and other nonresearch facilities, developing a research program commensurate with the role of these institutions in participating with 1862 institutions as partners to meet the agricultural research needs of their States, and providing improved research expertise for enhancement of their resident instruction and extension programs.

The research capability of these institutions is not comparable to that of the 1862 land-grant institutions. The 1890 institutions have received limited State construction funds for research facilities.

Furthermore, they were not eligible to participate in the modest Federal facilities program provided in the late 1960's and early 1970's for the 1862 land-grant institutions under the Research Facilities Act of 1963. This act does require State matching funds.

The absence of sufficient research facilities has forced the institutions to use the space provided for resident instruction and other campus programs to accommodate the research work supported by the payments to the institutions available under Public Law 95–113. In some institutions scientists are conducting research in classrooms during the hours that those rooms are not used for student instruction.

As a result, these institutions have been forced into very limited agricultural research programs which have been developed by making do under unfavorable circumstances. They have been unable either to develop research programs that could provide expertise to complement and enhance their instruction and extension program needs or to participate with the 1862 land-grant institutions in a balanced attack on the agricultural research problems in their States.

This concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to answer any questions you and other members of the subcommittee may have. Thank you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Dr. Bertrand. The attachment to your statement will be placed in the hearing record at this point.

[The attachment referred to above follows:]

1862 land-grant institutions

State—College or university	*Amount*
Alabama: Alabama A. & M. University	$2,042,635
Alabama: Tuskegee Institute	4,331,074

State—College or university	Amount
Arkansas: University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	$987,840
Delaware: Delaware State College	827,038
Florida: Florida A. & M. University	454,884
Georgia: Fort Valley State College	1,800,660
Kentucky: Kentucky State University	546,346
Louisiana: Southern University	973,058
Maryland: University of Maryland—Eastern Shore	79,794
Mississippi: Alcorn State University	796,212
Missouri: Lincoln University	1,207,742
North Carolina: North Carolina A. & T. State University	2,060,474
Oklahoma: Langston University	655,637
South Carolina: South Carolina State College	419,820
Tennessee: Tennessee State University	1,132,128
Texas: Prairie View A. & M. University	4,535,388
Virginia: Virginia State University	1,149,250

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Bertrand, I want to thank you for appearing here and for testifying. I find myself in substantial agreement with your statement. I do not think there is any dispute in this committee over the need for the authorization contained in this legislation or even the amount that is authorized over the next 5 years. In my judgment, it is even rather modest.

The fact that we do require State matching funds, and assuming that we do appropriate to the full authorization level, it would amount to $50 million with the combination of Federal and State contributions over the next 5 years.

As I indicated in my opening statement, I introduced the bill H.R. 7757 at the request of the Virginia State University. I might add that this is not in my district but is in my State. I feel some responsibility to represent them on this committee, because I am concerned about their mission as I am about that of all of the so-called 1890 institutions and Tuskegee.

The thing that does concern me a little bit—and I recognize what is set forth in your statement—is that the chairman's bill represents the result of a task force that studied the needs of the various 1890 institutions, but I want to ask you whether you feel it is sound public policy to depart from the traditional formula funding that we have known in the past and which is, in fact, part of the present law.

Dr. BERTRAND. Mr. Wampler, one certainly cannot question the effectiveness of the formula program that has been used traditionally. It has been effective. It has worked very well.

The administration's position on this bill is that since the 1890 institutions, their presidents and research directors, have over a period of 3 years studied this matter and indicated their specific needs, which are tied to program needs and which is in keeping with the policy of the Secretary of Agriculture, Bob Bergland, that new facilities must be keyed to program needs—therefore, we support this particular recommendation since it did come from the universities themselves.

There are, of course, other possibilities for distributing these funds that could be quite effective in developing the program that we are all interested in developing. We certainly recognize that.

Mr. WAMPLER. This perhaps goes a bit beyond the scope of the hearing today, but I have differed with the Secretary of Agricul-

67-719 O - 80 - 3

ture on his assessment of priorities in many cases in the area of agriculture research. I suppose reasonable men and women can differ on that assessment.

The point is that here we have 17 colleges and universities that would be affected by this legislation. As I look at the provision of the chairman's bill and the authorization and at the other institutions, colleges, and universities, there is a great disparity in many cases. It just leads me to wonder whether by reporting the chairman's bill we might be creating something that is going to cause animosity, lack of cooperation, and a disunited front.

This bothers me. I do not think that anyone could seriously question the need for this legislation. At least I would find it difficult to believe that anyone could because of what you said in your statement. That is exactly right as far as facilities and the lack of them is concerned.

Let me hasten to add that this is true to some extent in our land-grant colleges and institutions. I personally have seen many of them that are operating under conditions similar to that which you described. It is probably not as serious, but they are seriously hampered in terms of carrying out their mission.

My only concern is that when we depart from the traditional formula funding, we may be creating an atmosphere wherein we will have dissension, disagreement, and lack of cooperation.

I think, to get the full effect of what we want to do here, we have to have the support of everyone affected by this. Then, hopefully, as I indicated, we can reach some semblance of compromise which would be acceptable to all of the colleges and universities that are affected by this legislation.

Dr. BERTRAND. Mr. Wampler, I certainly agree with you that the bottom line is to get the funds to these institutions and to meet the needs.

I certainly agree with you also that there are many needs at the 1862 universities. We, in the Department, just wish that we could reach the authorization of the 1977 farm bill in this regard.

Mr. WAMPLER. Let me make one other option plain. It is a valid one. I think Ms. Chisholm testified that because we do require matching participation by the several States, as a practical matter, if I were a member of the State legislature in a State that did not fare so well under this distribution, I would be asking the question: "Why was my State overlooked and not favored as well as others?"

This becomes a very practical problem, I think, if we are going to require States to match. If I understand the provisions of the bill, unless the State does match, the Federal portion cannot be granted. Is that correct?

Dr. BERTRAND. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WAMPLER. The point I am making is that I want to see a fair and equitable formula distribution among these 17 institutions affected that would encourage the States to come up with their matching share.

Speaking only for myself, I would do everything that I could to influence members of my State legislature to match the part that would be allocated to the Virginia State University, as I would any other State, because I think it would be one of the wisest invest-

ments that any State could make by matching whatever the Federal grant is in their respective States.

That is my only concern. Is the formula fair? Is it one that everyone can agree upon and one that can come out of this committee so that we can go out on the floor of the House of Representatives and support it? Does it have some chance of passing and becoming the law of the land?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. If the gentleman would await the testimony of Dr. Simpson from Prairie View, he will give us a quite comprehensive genesis of this legislation and how it came about. I think it will answer all of the gentleman's questions with respect to how, where, and the figures.

I think his testimony will be very helpful. I would like to say that I do hope we do not get off on a tangent which, I am concerned, the gentleman may have injected, namely, that there will not be unanimity.

To my knowledge, the only dissenting vote has been from some attorneys for the Virginia institution. Otherwise, I have noticed in all of my meetings and all of my concern and intervention, as humble as it might be in this respect, unanimity among all of the institutions.

The figures, as I said, came from them. Any interjection of a different formula, or a formula that could conceivably not be handled at the time because of the prior lack of funding—some of the institutions might not be ready for formula funding.

I do hope that we do not go off on what seems to have been injected for some reason by two attorneys, not by the members of the board or authorities of the institutions.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your observation. Of course, I have the highest regard for Dr. Simpson. I have talked to him privately about this matter before and I respect his judgment.

My only concern is that any time we depart from traditional formula funding, I think we should do it very cautiously because I am afraid that it could bode ill for the programs that we all support and want to support.

I am quite anxious to hear from the other witnesses and to see if there is a consensus among the 17 institutions represented here. If that is what they want and they realize the precedent we are setting here, then I am perfectly willing to back them.

I just wanted to point out to Dr. Bertrand my concern any time that we depart from traditional formula funding, particularly in these vital areas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Dr. Bertrand. We appreciate your being here.

The next witness is Mr. B. D. Mayberry, director of research at the Tuskegee Institute.

STATEMENT OF B. D. MAYBERRY, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE

Mr. MAYBERRY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As you stated, I am B. D. Mayberry, director of research at Tuskegee Institute. I am honored to have been given the opportuni-

ty to testify on behalf of the research facility bill, H.R. 7557, designed for the historically black land-grant institutions.

Please be advised that it is not my purpose to deal with the legitimacy, the significance, the need, or the justification for the continued existence of these institutions. The fact that these institutions constitute a national resource of major proportions is no longer debatable. This is a fact that is now accepted in both the private and public sectors including local, State, and Federal governments.

The acceptance of the fact that historically black institutions constitute a major national research resource is not new. As early as 1897, the Alabama Legislature established at Tuskegee Institute the Tuskegee State Experiment Station.

The State support, however, was sufficient to provide partial research support for only one person, the director, Dr. George Washington Carver. It would be redundant to even attempt to recount the research accomplishments of Dr. Carver over his 46 years at Tuskegee Institute. The research accomplishments of Dr. Carver continue to serve agriculture and the Nation without regard to race, creed, or national origin.

In 1899, the U.S. Congress granted Tuskegee Institute 25,000 acres of land. However, land-grant status is not recognized at the State level.

On October 26, 1974, President Gerald Ford signed an omnibus bill designating Tuskegee as a national historic site and district. The bill was passed by the U.S. Congress in recognition of the contribution of the institution to the growth and development of the Nation—not just blacks.

Tuskegee, of course, is only one of the 17 historically black land-grant institutions. Similar accomplishments and recognitions could be discussed relative to each of them.

Now I will call your attention, more specifically, to the subject at hand—research and research facilities. The Morrill Act of 1890 mandated that the black land-grant colleges would be funded the same as if they had been established under the Morrill Act of 1862. For 90 years this provision has not been honored by the Southern States.

In 1972, for the first time, the black land-grant institutions received significant formula support for research. I recognize, however, that in the late 1960's there were some formula funds received, but it was only $283,000, to be divided among 17 campuses. This was provided through a 5-year grant mechanism under Public Law 89-106. The farm bill of 1977, Public Law 95-113, provided for the continuation of this support on an annual basis.

Two points here are noteworthy. One, the first continuing support for research at the black colleges was provided by the U.S. Congress. Two, research funds are provided to institutions which have been deprived since their inception of research facilities.

It is important to note that the research support which has been provided to the black colleges came by way of the U.S. Congress. Congress, therefore, has the opportunity and the obligation to provide support for research facilities such that the historically black land-grant institutions may maximize the potential benefits of funds provided for research by the Congress.

I have just received a copy of a report on the pending black college initiative. The report follows the memorandum of the President of January 1979, in which he directed several departments to develop programs for enhancing the growth and development of the historically black colleges.

I want to read one short statement from the report that is relevant to facilities. This, for the record, is in part 1, on page 11.

> Most of the historically black institutions are over 100 years old and face increasing pressures for renovation, modification, and maintenance of old buildings. Attention should be given to programs which provide assistance for facilities and equipment. Particular attention should be given to expanding support for upgrading agricultural and engineering facilities and equipment at historically black land-grant colleges.

Mr. Chairman, the research facilities bill, H.R. 7557, is your real opportunity to provide a service where it is needed most. We hope you will take advantage of this opportunity.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayberry. Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Mayberry, we thank you very much for coming and sharing your testimony with us this morning.

On page 2 of your statement, you said that, "for 90 years this provision has not been honored by the Southern States." You were referring to the Morrill Act of 1890 that mandated that black land-grant colleges would be funded the same way as if they had been established under the Morrill Act of 1862.

I certainly do not dispute the historical accuracy of that statement, because unfortunately I believe it is correct.

Let me ask you this. Do you feel that it is fair and appropriate that we have, under either of the two bills that are before us this morning, the provision that the Federal contribution of $25 million be matched by the several States that participate in the program? Is that a fair blend of mandatory matching, and is 50-50 a fair formula, in your estimation?

Mr. MAYBERRY. The exact proportion, of course—I am neither capable or in a position to say what it should be. It is not unrealistic, however, to require some matching.

In answering that question, though, I would like to refer to the question raised by the gentleman who left when he raised the question about this bill favoring the 1890 institutions. I would like the record to say that this bill does not favor the 1890 institutions.

If you would take a history of what has not been done for them since 1890, as compared to what has been done for the 1862's, this is not a bill of favor. It is just a token move toward catchup. This is what we are asking for.

Considering it from this point of view, it would not be unrealistic if it did not require matching. I would not want to put matching in the way of getting some support.

Mr. WAMPLER. I certainly did not mean to infer that it is a bill that favors the 1890's. Far from it. A bill of this magnitude certainly could not be interpreted that way at all, as you so well point out.

Let me ask you, since you indicated it and since I think history tells us that some of the States, and more especially some of the Southern States, have not honored what I think is their part of the

commitment to the 1890's—Do you have any reason to believe that they will now honor their portion in the next 5 years if we do enact this legislation? Do you have any reason to believe that they would not do it?

Mr. MAYBERRY. In this case, Mr. Wampler, the States have had an opportunity to demonstrate what they would honestly do. For 90 years they have not done it, so any statement I make now with respect to what the States would do would be based on belief.

We cannot afford, at this point, to rely on belief. As I pointed out earlier, the research support we receive—we rely on that research support—has been mandated by way of Congress. It is unrealistic for us to expect in the near future that significant support will come by any other means.

On that point, I would like to call your attention to page 10 of part 2. It is a very short statement dealing with the States.

I will read it:

> Federal programs which distribute resources through State mechanisms should be reviewed to determine the degree to which historically black institutions are excluded from those programs. Appropriate goals for participation should be established and transmitted to the appropriate State agencies.

This report does not state that the States are going to carry out their responsibilities. It is saying that from the congressional level down the States actions should be reviewed.

Mr. WAMPLER. Let me just ask you this specific question. Under the terms of the bill introduced by Mr. de la Garza, Alabama A. & M. University and Tuskegee Institute combined would receive a maximum of about $6,373,000 plus over the next 5 years. Do you believe that the legislature of the State of Alabama would match that amount over the next 5 years? Do you have any reason to believe that they would not do it?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I believe you are rewording the same question that you have already asked me. I have given you my opinion which I have no justification at this point for changing.

Mr. WAMPLER. I want aid and assistance to get to you, and if we are going to have a provision in the bill that requires matching participation and the State either cannot or will not do it, then we have not helped you much. That is my very point.

I have no reason to question the sincerity of any of the States that would be affected by this, but I want the States to understand that they have a responsibility.

I generally am regarded as an advocate of States rights. On the other hand, there is such a thing as State responsibility. When a State cannot or will not live up to its share of the bargain, then I think we have some responsibility on this committee to look carefully at how these programs are being implemented.

I hope you understand the thrust of my question.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I do understand the question, but I respect very highly the knowledge of this Congress about the State legislatures. You are recently from them. I would hope that the action that you take would be based on your experience of what you expect the States to do for the historically black land-grant colleges.

Mr. WAMPLER. I appreciate your statement. I cannot imagine that you and others who would be associated with Alabama A. & M. and with Tuskegee would not start now to do whatever is

necessary to be sure that the State of Alabama comes up with its matching share. I assure you that I will do that in Virginia and in any other States that I am called upon to help in.

I thank you very much.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman, in closing—I am sorry the gentleman left. I would like to add a little to Mrs. Chisholm's answer to the question of "the 1890's and Tuskegee Institute," if I may.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Go right ahead.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Tuskegee Institute was created by the State legislature in 1881 as the Tuskegee State Normal School for the training of negro boys and girls. The curriculum at that time included mainly agriculture, home economics, and the mechanical arts. This made Tuskegee a State school. The Governor appointed a three-man commission to govern the school.

In 1893 the State legislature incorporated the commission, named a board of trustees, gave it power to govern, and named Tuskegee Institute private. Therefore it is a public school named a private school.

In 1897, as I stated here, the State legislature established the Tuskegee State Experiment Station at Tuskegee Institute, and they kept us as a land-grant college not being designated as land-grant.

The U.S. Congress granted Tuskegee Institute 25,000 acres of land of which, in 1906, the State sold 5,000 acres and used the money to initiate Tuskegee's endowment. The other 20,000 acres were sold in 1926 by the board of trustees and that money went into the endowment.

Therefore, Tuskegee Institute, by whatever definition you use, is a public school with a semiprivate board of trustees. By the Federal Government it has been recognized since its inception as land grant, but in order to be a land-grant college—theoretically at least—you have to be designated as such by the Governor of the State. We have not been so honored.

Therefore, for two reasons—we were not created under the Morrill Act and we have not been designated as land grant—we are referred to as "the 1890 colleges and Tuskegee Institute."

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mayberry, I want you to know that it is a privilege to hear your testimony and that I have long been an admirer of your institute. I have also long admired the work of Dr. Carver in agricultural science as well as his prestigious leadership in other areas of human endeavor.

I would like to pursue this whole question of the matching funds, because I have just read the statement of my colleague, of whom I also think a great deal, Shirley Chisholm from New York. I notice that in her statement she suspects that the majority of the 1890 institutions would be unable to obtain the necessary State support in this Agriculture Department program.

It is one thing to believe in States rights, but the matching fund is a requirement on States responsibility. You can give the States a right, but how do you insist that they exercise their responsibility?

Apparently, State support has not been overwhelming, so she suggests that the ability to achieve the matching State funds will be limited by history and by prior experiences.

Would you say that the bill would be stronger if the matching State fund requirement were stricken from it?

Mr. MAYBERRY. I answer that really cautiously. There is such a thing as political expediency, I think. I think it is something you deal with. Funding for Tuskegee Institute, and I believe it is similar for the other colleges, would be greatly facilitated if we did not have to match.

Mrs. HECKLER. However, if you have a matching requirement, do you agree with Mrs. Chisholm or do you disagree with her? Do you agree that it would be very difficult to get the States to match these funds?

Mr. MAYBERRY. You want to put me in the position of kicking the horse I am riding. [Laughter.]

Mrs. HECKLER. I do not want to put you in that position.

Mr. MAYBERRY. I do not want to do that.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not know if the gentlelady heard Mr. Mayberry respond to a question by Mr. Wampler that history tells you. What is the history? Can Virginia match $1.2 million in 5 years under this legislation? What is the history? What have they done in the past? That would be the same in the gentlelady's State or in any other State. What is the history we are looking at? What have they done in the past few years?

Mrs. HECKLER. That is what Mrs. Chisholm has said.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. In questioning Mrs. Chisholm, we agreed that for part of her statement she may not have had all of the facts. I would suggest that the gentlelady read the last paragraph of Mrs. Chisholm's statement.

It seems that we have had only two witnesses so far and that our friends will probably provide more of an obstruction than they will assistance in arguing something which is secondary to the main thrust of trying to get some assistance to the 1890's, which is long overdue.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would like to tell the chairman that I have read Mrs. Chisholm's full statement. I read that last paragraph. It is quite clear. Therefore, I have some questions about the legislation. That is what is prompting my inquiry here. I can see the delicacy of the situation and would require no further statement from the witness.

Thank you.

Mr. MAYBERRY. Thank you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayberry.

I understand that Dr. Thomas of Prairie View was not able to be here. Is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You will present the statement, Dr. Simpson. Is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I think my statement is comprehensive enough to incorporate what Dr. Thomas would have said from the association. I will interject a few words.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, sir. We welcome you and would hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF OCLERIS SIMPSON, CHAIRMAN, ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH DIRECTORS; RESEARCH DIRECTOR, PRAIRIE VIEW A. & M. UNIVERSITY, TEXAS, ACCOMPANIED BY B. D. MAYBERRY, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE; DR. MELVIN E. WALKER, JR., FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH STATION, GEORGIA; ULYSSES S. WASHINGTON, JR., DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE, DOVER, DEL.; DR. JOHNNIE B. COLLINS, ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY, MISSISSIPPI; DR. HOWARD F. ROBINSON, NORTH CAROLINA A. & T. STATE UNIVERSITY, GREENSBORO, N.C.; DR. ROBERT L. HURST, SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, ORANGEBURG, S.C.; DR. P. S. BENEPAL, VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY, PETERSBURG, VA.; AND DR. C. D. IGNASIAS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, EASTERN SHORE, PRINCESS ANNE, MD.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to ask my fellow research directors to come up to the table as resource persons.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, today it is indeed a pleasure for me to stand before you and present testimony for H.R. 7557. Several voting members of the Association of Research Directors, or ARD, as a body of one, are with me today as resource witnesses. Most of us are academic products of the eligible 1890 land-grant college system and we are proud to be from among that sector.

Mr. Chairman, these voting members are, beginning at my extreme right: Mr. U. S. Washington, Delaware State College; Dr. Johnnie Collins, Alcorn State University, Mississippi; Dr. Melvin E. Walker, Fort Valley State College, Georgia; Mr. B. D. Mayberry, Tuskegee Institute; Dr. Howard F. Robinson, North Carolina A. & T. University; Dr. Robert L. Hurst, South Carolina State College; Dr. Dennis Ignasias, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; Dr. P. S. Benepal, Virginia State University.

Mr. Chairman, in my testimony today, I would like to indicate that it has been approximately 1,355 days since H.R. 7557 was first conceived. Therefore, I wish first to trace the evolution of the bill.

Congressman Frank E. Evans of Colorado, on the evening of November 12, 1976, challenged the 1890 colleges to take a serious look at their pressing requirements for agricultural research facilities and then bring a proposal to the Congress for help.

A few weeks later two research directors, one vice president, and a representative of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges met in Atlanta, Ga., and agreed upon a draft bill for agricultural research facilities in the amount of $75 million. The funds were to be distributed by the magic formula used by USDA to distribute program funds for Public Law 89-106.

The bill was presented to former Congressman Frank E. Evans and we believed that our work had been done. Mr. Evans reviewed our work and stated that $75 million appeared reasonable, but how were we to know that we did not need $100 million, or maybe we only needed $10 million? How were we to know how much each institution needed? Mr. Evans stated further that Congress would want a data base to justify a request for facilities, which is unlike a population formula used for program funding, such as the Hatch Act or section 1445 in Public Law 95-113.

We were then told to go and make a detailed survey of each institution's facility needs and that cost figure alone would be the formula.

In the early spring of 1977 ARD called a meeting here in Washington, D.C., with some members of USDA in attendance. During that spring meeting I was drafted to organize and coordinate the development of the research facility data base.

Immediately, data collection sheets were designed to permit one to account for the then current research programs, personnel, office space, laboratory space, supporting facilities and projected requirements. Guidelines in use by the General Services Administration were used as a standard to formulate the amount of space required for a senior scientist plus his or her associates. These data sheets were distributed among our presidents and research directors.

Dollar figures for renovation and construction were computerized along with the data submitted by each institution.

The grand total amounted to $47,269,578 and was comprised of the following: Alabama A. & M. University, $3,158,750; Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, $9,572,546; University of Arkansas, $2,665,311; Delaware State University, $1,802,000; Florida A. & M. University, $912,300; Fort Valley State College, Georgia, $4,031,330; Kentucky State University, $306,945; Southern University, Louisiana, $2,254,953; University of Maryland, $160,000; Alcorn State University, Mississippi, $1,350,500; Lincoln University, Missouri, $2,540,200; North Carolina A. & T. State University, $3,523,800; Langston University, Oklahoma, $1,031,920; South Carolina State University, $866,975; Tennessee State University, $1,970,800; Prairie View A. & M. University, Texas, $10,199,200; Virginia State College, $922,048.

In an attempt to account for some inflation and planning costs we requested a round figure of $50 million, with approximately $3 million distributed equally on a nonmatching basis.

Our revised draft bill was again presented to former Congressman Frank Evans. This draft was then sent to the Congressional Research Service for analysis. We were later asked to respond to certain questions in writing. This we did.

After submitting the analysis and later discussing it with the Congressman, he gave me these words of wisdom and warning:

> As soon as the Congress begins to act like it's going to pass this bill, several of your institutions will come back and say that they didn't ask for enough money. It would be foolish to become involved in that type of game. You would never have agreement. You would never have a bill. I am not interested in making a series of changes.

Our presidents continued to encourage us to stay in touch with the Congress and see that this bill passed.

Later we learned that Mr. Evans had decided not to run for reelection to the Congress. In a subsequent conference Mr. Evans explained to me that it would be better for him not to introduce this bill and then walk away from the Congress before action could be taken.

Meanwhile, in 1978, I moved from the Fort Valley State College in Georgia to that great State of Texas for employment at Prairie View A. & M. University. Our data bank was transferred and developments continued from there.

We then turned to the chairman of this subcommittee and its ranking minority member for help. On April 4, 1979, a letter, which represented the first official response on the bill by the Congress, to USDA was initiated.

In June 1979, I was called upon to work with the Science and Education Administration to assist in making a more detailed analysis of each institution's catchup needs as reflected in the data base presented to USDA and the Congress. Each institution was again contacted and asked to reflect any updating of information and existing data were checked further for inaccuracies.

For example, Virginia State requested that its askings be increased from the previously reported $0.9 million to the new figure of $2.3 million, and Tennessee State moved from $1.9 million to $2.2 million. Prairie View A. & M. University of Texas gave up and shared $1.1 million with Virginia State University so that the goals of that school could be met. Likewise, Tuskegee Institute gave up $0.9 million to share with Virginia State and other institutions which required adjustments.

These data analyses, in terms of projections, reflected a total of 560 science years, with 33 percent of those science years being accounted for in the program area of people, communities, and institutions with an emphasis on food, nutrition, and rural development. Twenty-four percent of those science years were attributed to research on animals, including agriculture. Twenty-one percent of the science years were attributed to research with crops, with an emphasis on soybeans, certain small grains, fruits, vegetables, and peanuts. Sixteen percent were for natural resources. Four percent were for economics of marketing, and 1 percent was for general, which reflected the fertilizer research and development center on the campus of Fort Valley State College in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, one tragedy did occur during the review process. The University of Maryland at Eastern Shore should have been adjusted upward by approximately $240,000, but we failed to get that request into the data bank on schedule for analysis by USDA. I accept full responsibility for this accident.

The president of UMES did not panic when we asked him to have faith. No more than 5 minutes before coming into this hearing, I again called the president of UMES to see if he still had faith, and he assured me that he has faith in the de la Garza bill.

Therefore, this group stands ready to cooperate with the Congress, the Secretary, and our presidents in righting this wrong for the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, this body is not unaware of and is saddened by the fact that Virginia State University is now unhappy because the distribution of catchup funds in H.R. 7557 is based upon need rather than population, and we are saddened by the fact that Prairie View and Tuskegee Institute have already shared in order to meet a prior request of Virginia State University.

Mr. Chairman, USDA's ultimate response to the April 4, 1979, letter was the submission of the administration's version of the bill to support the catchup facility needs of the 1980 colleges. This bill, therefore, contains a provision for matching by the States at the rate of 50 percent.

Our version did not contain a provision for matching. It called for 100-percent funding by the Congress over a 5-year period. We can appreciate the concern of OMB in using the matching requirement in H.R. 7557 to encourage the States to more fully participate in the support of the 1890 colleges and State universities and we very much want and need their help.

However, we feel that the rate of 50 cents on the dollar is much too high to be sufficiently attractive to the States to bring about broad and rapid support.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we believe that a matching rate by the States of 10 cents and not more than 15 cents on the dollar would constitute the type of carrot which would cause a stampede for victory in the halls of every Southern State to join the Federal Government in the effort to provide catchup funds for agricultural research facilities at the 1890 land-grant colleges.

This cooperation is what we want. This is what the administration wants. We believe that the Congress would be happy with this and today, Mr. Chairman, this is what we are asking for. We need your help and support for 10 percent matching in H.R. 7557.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was drafted long before Public Law 95–113 was enacted and the passing of Public Law 95–113 in 1977 further called out the pressing need for research facilities. Thus, research in agriculture at the 1890 colleges is faced with a dilemma; namely, to continue to carry out research activities on a limited basis with the impetus of permanent funds granted by Congress under the authority of Public Law 95–113, or to curtail research, reduce the current staff, and utilize several years funds for capital expenditures and then attempt to regain the research tempo already created by Congress with funds under the authority of Public Law 89–106.

It should be clear to the Congress today that the facilities being utilized for research were largely never intended for that use but were almost always less than first class facilities built for teaching purposes.

The gravity of the situation may best be typified by example comments from the benchside scientists as follows:

> Have you ever tried to establish a sophisticated basic research program in nitrogen fixation in 800 square feet on the second floor of an inadequately wired, 25-year-old, rat-infested building without a freight elevator, central air-conditioning, or even hot running water?
>
> Do you think that it is possible to carry out a soils research program and be asked to vacate your laboratory on a periodic basis so that undergraduate students may come in for a regular class exercise?
>
> Have you tried doing research on normal plants in the same greenhouse with those grown by fellow plant pathologists or tried doing research with small animals without a laboratory suitable for that purpose?

Mr. Chairman, the central thrust of the catchup legislation, or H.R. 7557, is to move the programs of the 1890 institutions from their pauperized circumstances to a standard bearer in participating with the 1862 land-grant institutions in a balanced attack on the research needs of people in the States.

The type of facilities constructed or modernized would help to provide the kind of expertise needed to complement and enhance the range of needs in our instruction and extension programs.

Again, the thrust of a 10-percent matching requirement by the States would most probably assure and assert the type of unity desired among the Federal Government, States, and 1890 colleges.

Mr. Chairman, this body is aware of authorizations for facilities in Public Law 95–113. We have noted the formula for distributing those funds, and it is clear that if every authorized dollar were appropriated the 1890 colleges would receive just about enough funds to cover equipment and pasture renovation costs.

Consequently, we participated fully as a partner with ESCOP and the Department in the national facility study as mandated by the Congress in Public Law 95–113. There was nothing in the national study which would suggest that we not request this catchup legislation as described in H.R. 7557.

Mr. Chairman, we could have requested an alternate piece of legislation. For instance, we could have asked for $25 million with no matching, but that would not be enough. We could have asked for $25 million with matching, but that would not be enough. We need the $50 million requested in H.R. 7557, and that is enough to provide the catchup needs of our institutions today.

We ask the help of this subcommittee in making our request a reality.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, on behalf of my president, if he were here today he would tell you that he supports this legislation. I know this because only a few days ago a member of our board of regents wrote him a letter noting that he had read in the Chronicle of Higher Education Journal that H.R. 7557 had been introduced and he wondered what this would do for Prairie View.

Our president replied to his letter and said that Prairie View is very much aware of this bill and "I shall be coming to the board for matching requirements." We need the help of that board.

Mr. Chairman, I will respond to any questions.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Dr. Simpson.

Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Simpson, I thank you for your very comprehensive statement of the background. I want to compliment you on what I am sure were many hours, days, and weeks of effort in fashioning the input into the legislation that is before us today. At the outset, you introduced a member of your panel who is from Virginia State University. Did you not?

Dr. SIMPSON. I did. Dr. Benepal.

Mr. WAMPLER. I am sorry that I missed it in the introduction. Let me ask him the question.

Do you agree with the statement that Dr. Simpson has made here this morning?

Dr. BENEPAL. No; I do not. I do not agree with the matching provisions and the distribution of the funding.

Mr. WAMPLER. Are you speaking, Dr. Simpson, as the consensus spokesman for the panel?

Dr. SIMPSON. Yes, Congressman. I speak for the consensus of the panel. The panel is very much aware that there is one institution that does not agree with the association. The association works for all and if we look at the majority situation, we have a consensus.

We are looking at 16 out of 17. We do not have 100 percent agreement.

Mr. WAMPLER. It would be fair to say then that 16 of the 17 institutions agree with the bill as introduced by Mr. de la Garza with the reservations expressed.

Dr. SIMPSON. That is correct. Perhaps when I said that we appear as a body of one, maybe I should have said, "two."

Mr. WAMPLER. I appreciate your clarifying that. There was apparently some misunderstanding in my mind and perhaps in the minds of other members of the committee.

Let me just say at the outset that there are two things that bother me about Mr. de la Garza's bill. The one I have already expressed is its departure from the traditional formula funding. I realize that this is supposed to be a catchup type of thrust and that in the collective judgment of those of you present the allocation according to other than traditional formula funding is justified on the basis of your priorities and what you concede to be the greatest need.

The other one is the matter about which I had some discussion with Dr. Mayberry, namely, the requirement for 50 percent matching. Speaking only for myself, I would be perfectly prepared to let this be a full Federal participation on a one-time basis in an effort to catch up.

I realize that that alone would not do it, as you point out. $25 million alone would not do it. It would mean that if we were to achieve what you think is fair and just, it would require at least a $50 million commitment, regardless of what Federal-State match or mix there might be.

Again, I want to point out that it would seem to me that the State legislatures ought to look carefully at any percentage participation that we would put in the bill.

Do you feel that if we were to say that it would be a 90 percent Federal grant with a 10 percent State match, that that would meet the objections of the Office of Management and Budget? Have you had any input from them?

Dr. SIMPSON. I have not run that particular ratio by anyone in OMB, but I think the biggest insistence of OMB is that there be matching. I do not know how strong they were on the 50 percent. I do feel OMB will pretty much stand by the matching requirement.

Let us admit it. It is easy for all of us to say there will be no matching, but I think we are realistic individuals. There is merit in having some degree of matching, but I think the 10 or 15 percent would be sufficient to induce the States to immediately match. That is really a carrot that nobody can walk away from.

At the same time, I feel we will have met the requirement of OMB that there be matching.

Mr. WAMPLER. I appreciate your observation and recommendation in that regard. I am sure that that is something that the committee will want to take to heart as we try to fashion the final version of the legislation.

Again, let me just say this. I realize your reason for doing so, but I think that any time you depart from your traditional formula funding, it is setting a dangerous precedent which may come back to haunt all of us.

It seems to me that population is just about as fair a way as you can do it. I realize that there is no perfect way, but believe me, formula funding is the result of years of experience and what we perceive as being the fairest way to do it, realizing that it is not totally without inequities.

I just wanted you to understand that. I am completely in sympathy with what this bill attempts to do, regardless of which way we get at it, as they say down in my Lorton country. I want to assure you that we will look at it very carefully.

Speaking for myself, I want to see us develop a bill that can become law and that the 1890's and Tuskegee be given sufficient resources to carry out the mission that I think you want to carry out and which you are capable of doing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions, but I would like to say that I think the witness made a very fine presentation and that I am very sympathetic to the point of view that he has expressed. I shall certainly consider it when we go into markup session.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Dr. Simpson and the rest of the gentlemen who accompany you. We appreciate very much your work and your diligence in this effort.

Our next witness is Dr. Huey J. Battle, professor of economics at Virginia State University.

Dr. Battle?

Mr. WAMPLER. Dr. Battle, of course, is not a constituent of mine since he does not reside within my congressional district, but in addition to being professor of economics, it is my understanding that he is also the senior vice president of Virginia State University at Petersburg, Va. I want to take this opportunity to welcome Dr. Battle here before the committee.

STATEMENT OF DR. HUEY J. BATTLE, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. BATTLE. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the Virginia State University on H.R. 7757, a bill to assist the 1890 land-grant colleges in the construction and improvement of facilities for agricultural research. The bill would provide an efficient and equitable method by which to distribute funds contained in the fiscal 1981 budget for this purpose.

The purpose of Mr. Wampler's bill, H.R. 7757, is substantially the same as the administration's bill, H.R. 7557. Both bills are designed to carry out the intent of Congress to encourage agricultural research and to strengthen the capabilities of the 1890 colleges to fully participate in efforts to develop and improve our Nation's agriculture.

By allocating funds according to the same formula currently used for grants to support ongoing research by the 1890 colleges, H.R. 7757 provides a more equitable national distribution of funds. In adopting this formula, Congress clearly intended to assist the 1890 colleges in meeting the needs and solving the problems of farmers in their respective States. Under the formula each school

receives funds in proportion to the farm and rural populations in its State. We believe this formula should be applied to the allocation of funds for research facilities.

However, the administration bill would give 2 of the 17 1890 land-grant colleges and Tuskegee close to 40 percent of the total amount of available funds, and 4 of the total over 53 percent of the funds. Under the Wampler bill no individual college would receive more than 10.2 percent.

We would like to submit for the record something which I think is very important—a table showing the breakdown of population and funds under the two bills. You will find it attached to my written statement. It is clear that the Wampler bill provides funds more equitably.

Virginia State University has only recently attained university status and has reactivated its school of agriculture. The need for capital funds at this time is especially great. We feel that the intent of Congress would be dwarfed should the people of Virginia be denied their fair share of research facilities funds at a time when every effort is being made to improve Virginia State's services to Virginia agriculture.

We are strongly opposed to the matching provision of H.R. 7557. One concern of Congress that led to the granting of Federal funds to the 1890 colleges is the limited availability of State funds. This concern pervades the legislative history of title XIV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977.

The inclusion of the matching provision makes H.R. 7557 almost an empty promise in some States. For this reason, the Wampler bill contains no matching requirement.

In order to meet the needs of our Nation's farmers and to fulfill the intent of Congress to provide equitable funding for agricultural research and education, we support early action on the Wampler bill, H.R. 7757.

Virginia State University could not stand by and support such a disproportionate distribution of funds among the 1890 schools plus Tuskegee. It is viewed as unjust and needs to be corrected in a bill. The Wampler bill does just that.

Dr. Law, president of Virginia State University, wants it to be clearly understood that Virginia State University stands to gain only in a minor way by the use of the formula, but it is a fair instrument and should be used.

Twelve out of the seventeen colleges are better served using this formula. President Law informed the presidents of the 1890's about 2 years ago, when this first came to his attention, about the distribution schedule and at that point he was opposed to the distribution.

I think there may be a bit of misunderstanding about the supporters of the Wampler bill. I understand that the University of Maryland at Eastern Shore has considered the Wampler bill and is interested in supporting that bill.

Just a few moments ago, President Law called and said that he had just spoken with the president of Florida A. & M. and that they support this bill totally.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to present the views of Virginia State University. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, Dr. Battle. Without objection, the table you submitted with your statement will be included in the record at this point.

[The table referred to above follows:]

COLLEGE (state)	FARM POPULATION ***	RURAL POPULATION ***	H.R. 7557 ADMIN. BILL $ ***	H.R. 7757 — MAUPLIN BILL* $ ***
ALABAMA A&M UNIVERSITY (Alabama) **	159,641 4.7	1,432,224 6.0	2,042,635 8.5	1,301,175 5.4
TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE (Alabama) **	159,641 4.7	1,432,224 6.0	4,331,074 18.0	1,301,175 5.4
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS at Pine Bluff (Arkansas)	173,677 5.1	962,630 4.0	987,840 4.1	1,152,670 4.8
DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE (Delaware)	11,360 0.3	152,535 0.6	827,038 3.4	375,081 1.6
FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY (Florida)	72,261 2.1	1,321,306 5.5	454,884 1.9	1,012,494 4.2
FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE (Georgia)	171,544 5.0	1,921,501 7.6	1,900,660 7.9	1,490,037 6.2
KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY (Kentucky)	381,696 11.1	1,534,653 6.4	546,366 2.2	1,963,771 8.2
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (Louisiana)	113,757 3.3	1,235,156 5.1	973,058 4.0	1,094,104 4.6
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND - Eastern Shore (Maryland)	62,385 1.8	917,436 3.8	79,794 0.3	823,467 3.4
ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY (Mississippi)	210,323 6.1	1,330,270 5.1	796,212 3.3	1,362,191 5.7
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY (Missouri)	389,319 10.5	1,398,810 5.8	1,207,742 5.0	1,844,210 7.7
NORTH CAROLINA A&T STATE UNIVERSITY (North Carolina)	374,492 10.9	2,796,891 11.6	2,060,474 8.5	2,441,948 10.2
LANGSTON STATE UNIVERSITY (Oklahoma)	175,349 5.1	819,092 3.4	655,637 2.7	1,100,059 4.6
SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE (South Carolina)	111,528 3.2	1,358,321 5.7	419,820 1.7	1,137,094 4.7
TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY (Tennessee)	316,817 9.2	1,618,380 6.7	1,132,129 4.7	1,815,105 7.6
PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY (Texas)	386,174 11.2	2,275,784 9.4	4,535,388 18.8	2,271,792 9.5
VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY (Virginia)	192,784 5.6	1,713,653 7.1	1,149,250 4.7	1,506,331 6.3

* The formula set forth in Section 4 of H.R. 7757 is derived from Section 1445 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 5322).

** In computing the distribution of funds allocated...the allotments to Tuskegee Institute and Alabama Agriculture and Mechanical University are determined as if each institution were in a separate state.

*** The figures do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Wampler?

Mr. WAMPLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Battle, I thank you for your presence here this morning and the statement that you have shared with the committee. There is one point on which I would like to ask your opinion. The bill that I introduced provides for no State matching. It would be totally Federal participation.

The bill introduced by Mr. de la Garza provides for a 50-percent Federal-State match. In the event that we were to reach, or attempt to reach, some type of compromise in this area of the bill that would provide for a 90-percent Federal participation and a 10-percent State match, do you feel that that would be acceptable to your institution?

Dr. BATTLE. The probability of States getting 10 percent would certainly be greater than their getting 50 percent, and it would be a more palatable bill than it presently is.

Mr. WAMPLER. You would not take violent exception to a compromise of 90-percent Federal and 10-percent State participation?

Dr. BATTLE. I do not think so. For 10 percent I think we could compromise.

Mr. WAMPLER. I know that every member of this committee wants to see full utilization of the total authorization in this bill, regardless of what the formula is. It was pointed out by Dr. Mayberry in his statement that he felt that a 90-percent Federal and 10-percent State, or an 85-percent Federal and 15-percent State match, was more realistic and more achievable.

That is not to say that we are not without our fiscal problems here in the Federal Government, because we are, and believe me there is a bottom to the barrel. Anytime that we take a bill before the Congress, especially the House of Representatives, that calls for new authorizations, we have to justify them.

Let me say to you, Dr. Battle, and to the others here this morning who are interested in this bill, we have to get some type of compromise on which we can agree among ourselves, because if we were to go to the floor of the House and were divided, then our chances of success would be extremely limited. The questions I am asking are simply an effort to explore areas where we can reach compromise and ones that will enhance the chances of passage of this bill.

The other thing that concerns me and which I have propounded of other witnesses is the question of distribution of the funds. I think you have made it abundantly clear that you feel it would be more efficient and more equitable to use the traditional formula funding rather than that which has been submitted to us by the task force and as is represented in Mr. de la Garza's bill. Is that correct?

Dr. BATTLE. I agree that anytime a bill would respond to the needs more favorably of 12 out of 17 institutions—I think this is what the committee would be interested in, namely, serving all of these institutions as fully as you possibly can with the limited funds available.

Mr. WAMPLER. Let me say finally, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me to be a bit parochial, I want to express my appreciation to Virginia State University for the fine way in which I feel they are serving the needs not only of agriculture in Virginia but of our entire population. We are very grateful. I hope you will express my appreciation to your colleagues.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. I want to thank the witness for his very fine testimony. Obviously there is a big difference of opinion between you and the prior panel, Dr. Battle. I would ask why you feel that the criteria based on need is not appropriate. Why is it not deserving if the need is justified?

Dr. BATTLE. I think this. Any one of the institutions really could have presented a need which would probably equal or exceed the amount of money appropriated, so the only way to get at a fair situation would be to use what we have been using over time,

namely, a formula which is supposedly fair. We have accepted that so I see no reason why that same formula would not be applicable to the others.

As was indicated, the formula would be less than the last request that we put in as needs, so the question is really: How great are the needs?

Mrs. HECKLER. Dr. Battle, do you disagree with any of the figures, formulations, or quantifications of need that the other colleges have submitted? Do you think they are accurate?

Dr. BATTLE. Do you mean the schedule of needs?

Mrs. HECKLER. Yes.

Dr. BATTLE. I do think they are inaccurate.

Mrs. HECKLER. You say they are inaccurate.

Dr. BATTLE. I think so. For example, in our case the amount that we requested is not reflected here—that is, the last request that we put in. The earlier one is reflected. Because Virginia State College became Virginia State University on July 1, 1980, and because we reactivated the school of agriculture, our needs are different from what they were earlier. We submitted that, but that is not included in the schedule now, and I suspect there might be others.

Mrs. HECKLER. I am questioning whether or not you have analyzed the need figures and the actual amounts specified by the other universities and found them, upon careful analysis, to be inaccurate. Would you say that is true?

Dr. BATTLE. When you say "the needs" are you talking about the bare needs or are you talking about the full needs to carry on the research projects? In Virginia State University's case I am sure that that is inaccurate.

As I look at some of the others, I do not want to address my discussion to the names of certain institutions as I have addressed Virginia State, but there are several such institutions, I think, who are really hurting because of the scheduled amounts coming to them based on the schedule they have here.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Dr. Battle, let me ask you this. The difference between the so-called needs as provided in the one bill, and the formula as provided in the other bill—what will be the difference in dollars and cents for Virginia State?

Mr. BATTLE. You mean based on the formula?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes. You heard the testimony of Dr. Simpson that they had some problem in that the last amount submitted by Virginia was not incorporated, et cetera. Under the needs as submitted by Virginia State and under the formula, what would be the difference?

Dr. BATTLE. The last request that we placed would have been $3,457,332.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. When was that made?

Dr. BATTLE. That request was put in in 1979 to the director of science and education cooperative extension research.

The dollars that it would mean to Virginia State would be something like a little better than $300,000 over what is presently being submitted, but it would be less than what we were requesting earlier.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Were you a party to the initial discussions in relation to the need when it was submitted to the group?

Dr. BATTLE. No; I was not invited. The director was invited and the former director was there.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Have you personally been a party to any of the negotiations or any of the submissions?

Dr. BATTLE. We have, on a number of occasions, spoken to the various members of the 1890 institutions.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I mean you, personally.

Dr. BATTLE. Yes; I have spoken with them.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I mean, in the submission of the figures, in the study—did you participate personally in developing the figures that were presented to the organization of the 1890 colleges?

Dr. BATTLE. No. The figures that were presented from Virginia State University—and I suppose this is true of some other institutions—were submitted by the director. This did not, to my knowledge, bear the signature of the president on the figures.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You are therefore in another ballpark. You have not been a part of the negotiation process with the organization. You have not participated in the submission or compilation of the figures. Is that right?

Dr. BATTLE. I have participated in the submission of the figures that went in in November 1979 to update this, because Virginia State was becoming a university and because we were reactivating the school of agriculture——

Mr. DE LA GARZA. What do you mean by reactivating?

Dr. BATTLE. About 5 years ago, we had a school of agriculture at Virginia State. I am not quite sure of the number of years—the school of agriculture in its present form was somewhat disbanded. Agriculture remained there but was divided into other schools on the campus. We found that this did not meet the needs and there was a great concern on the part of Virginians that the school of agriculture be reactivated, and this was done.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Why was it deactivated? Was there one specific legislative action? How did this come about?

Dr. BATTLE. This is done through the State council of higher education, which is responsible to work with curriculum. It was instructed, based on the number of students we had at the time, that the cost per student was too high. Some of the programs we had were no longer offered and some of them were put into various other schools.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Let me interrupt, if I may. Was that done with or without the consent of the president or board of Virginia State?

Dr. BATTLE. The present president was not there. At that time it was done with the consent of the former president.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. He is no longer there.

Dr. BATTLE. That is right.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. This was the same time when the research was being done for funds.

Dr. BATTLE. That is true.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Let me ask you this, doctor. It is very sincere but very frank. You may not wish to answer it and it may not even be fair of me to ask it, but I am so interested in this legislation. Are you willing to sacrifice the whole bill for $300,000 more that

Virginia would get under the formula as submitted by Mr. Wampler?

Dr. BATTLE. This is a most serious problem. Just for Virginia State to get $300,000 more dollars is not the issue. What we look at, frankly, is the justness, the fairness, of the distribution of these funds.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. That is one of my areas of concern. What is more fair than what people say they need, rather than a formula based on, conceivably, fiction? I do not know who made that formula.

Dr. BATTLE. I would submit to you that if these same institutions——

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not mean a wish list. Every institution in the United States could use 100, 200, or 300 percent more, but I take it at face value that they said, "This is the minimum, the least, of our need." I know they can use more, but this is the minimum. This is their bare bones need.

What is more fair than that compared to some fictional formula based on whether people move in or out of the State?

Dr. BATTLE. Well, sir, when we talk about needs we put it in quotes, because it is not easily defined. I would think that if the funds were distributed by a formula which has been established and accepted as fair and just, you would not have these institutions coming back a year or two from now saying that they were treated unfairly or that they need so and so.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Who says that this other formula is fair and just?

Dr. BATTLE. If it is not fair and just, that formula needs to be revised. This is what we have been using for the allocation of the research funds. This is the same formula that I am suggesting.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The fact is that the research facility funds for the 1862's have no matching at all. They get it all. Here we are talking about a one-shot catchup and then we will see if we can move you into the mainstream with the others. Do you see what we are trying to do?

Dr. BATTLE. Yes, but if school x is getting x number of dollars, which is a percentage of the total dollars that they have been getting for research, then it follows that when we talk about the facility to conduct the research it should be in some kind of proportion to that.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. To the need.

Dr. BATTLE. Yes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. That is what we are trying to do. I did not come up with this figure. It is what they brought me and said, "Here is the list of schools. Here is what they need." What am I to do? Should I dispute Dr. Simpson's word and say, "No, doctor, those are not your needs."

Dr. BATTLE. You ask what you are to do. I would submit to you that the use of the formula would mean that there could be no questions hereafter about whether or not this was fair or just until the formula is changed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Come hell or high water you want the formula, no matter what happens, because you say that it is fair, or somebody said that it is fair.

Dr. BATTLE. That is true.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yet, no one can accurately say that any formula is fair at any time because anyone can find exceptions to it.

Dr. BATTLE. May I say this. As far as we know at the moment, it is the best instrument that we have for equitable distribution of the funds. If that is not true, then the manner in which the grants are made each year needs to be revised.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I can see that we would just prolong the agony here by discussing this further. I maintain this: What is more equitable than fulfilling a person's needs, or what he says are his needs? What is more equitable than that?

Dr. BATTLE. Again, sir, the needs, I say, are in quotes and not easily determined.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, doctor. I appreciate your being here and your contribution.

Needless to say, we have some disagreement but I trust that this disagreement will be ironed out. I do hope though—and I say this with all due respect to you and to all of the authorities at Virginia State—I may get into an area that I probably should not discuss in public, so I will thank you very much for being here.

Dr. BATTLE. I would just like to underscore a statement that I have already said, namely, what we are saying at Virginia State—and frankly I feel that there are silent partners here—is that what we are pushing for at Virginia State is just, fair distribution of the limited funds that we have that may be coming to us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. With that, no one can argue. We thank you very much, sir.

We have two other witnesses scheduled for this afternoon. I wonder if, Dr. Morrison and Mr. Halpin, your testimony could be condensed somehow. If we could hear you now there would be no need for us or you to come back this afternoon. Would that be agreeable with you, Dr. Morrison?

Dr. MORRISON. Certainly, sir.

Mr. HALPIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. If both of you would come to the witness table, we will start with you, Dr. Morrison. Immediately after Dr. Morrison, we will hear Mr. Halpin.

Dr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very short written statement. I shall read most of it and make a few comments and then be open for questions.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD DAVID MORRISON, PRESIDENT, ALABAMA A. & M. UNIVERSITY, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Dr. MORRISON. My name is Richard David Morrison. I am president of Alabama A. & M. University at Huntsville, Ala. I am also chairman of the council of 1890 land-grant college presidents.

My educational experiences have mostly been in the land-grant system. My academic degrees were earned from Tuskegee Institute, Cornell University, and Michigan State University. I have taught agriculture both in high schools and at the college level and I was director of agriculture at Alabama A. & M. University before becoming president.

I have served on numerous committees in USDA. Presently, I am a member of the Joint Council of Food and Agriculture Science, USDA/SEA. Last summer, during the month of August, I was one of the United Nations delegates chosen to attend the U.N. conference on science and technology for development which convened in Vienna. Having related this bit of background information, let me plunge into the reason why I am here.

Up to this point, during the 90-year period since the passage of the second Morrill Act, on August 30, 1890, the historically black land grant institutions established by an act of Congress have been unable to share in certain funds made available for other land grant institutions.

More specifically, I am here to speak on behalf of H.R. 7557, which has as its purpose,

> To provide grants to States for the purpose of assisting the colleges eligible to receive funds under the act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee Institute, in the purchase of equipment and land, and the planning, construction, alteration, and renovation of buildings to strengthen their capacity for food and agricultural research.

We, as a group of 1890 institutions, worked for more than 2 years collecting data in support of our request. These data are in keeping with procedures and policies established by USDA. They helped to establish a valid basis for making our requests for agricultural research facilities.

I have found support for this bill throughout the land grant system. The National Association of State Universities and land grant colleges has endorsed our request for research facilities. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has supported our efforts by giving guidance on procedural matters and the gathering of background data.

Thus far, everyone with whom I have talked agrees that there is an urgent need for research facilities at these institutions. The fact is that these institutions throughout their history have never received Federal or State funds for research facilities.

It is true that under Public Law 89-106 funds were made available for agricultural research at 1890 institutions, but not for research facilities. Under title XIV, section 1445, of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1977, funds for agricultural research at the 1890 institutions and Tuskegee were made available, but again no funds for research facilities were appropriated.

The question may well be raised: How is research being conducted presently at these institutions where research facilities are so scarce? If one were to visit these institutions the question would be answered on the spot. These institutions are crowding their agricultural research activities into the limited academic research laboratories. The crowded condition, most surely, places a handicap upon the effectiveness of the quality of work that may be accomplished.

Basically, the 1890 institutions are seeking funds with which they can help to bring their meager agricultural research facilities up to a point where they can make better use of the research funds now provided for in section 1445 of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1977.

Furthermore, there is a deep desire on the part of these institutions, to conduct high quality research programs that have the possibility of contributing to society's needs.

May I quickly cite two examples. At one of these 1890 institutions the most outstanding research work on sweet potato breeding in the United States is being conducted. Already four new varieties have been certified and are now being used by farmers. These varieties are superior to other varieties in quality, disease resistance, yields, and storage quality.

At another 1890 institution, the largest center for research on triticale in the United States is located. This small grain crop, a cross between rye and wheat, is proving to have great possibilities as a food and forage crop.

The results of these two examples of research—sweet potatoes and triticale—may be far reaching in that both have the possibility of helping to feed the multitudes in the future. Examples like the two given above could be repeated with reference to research conducted at each of the 1890 institutions.

To some extent, these 1890 institutions are gearing their research toward problems that affect low-income people, but not exclusively. This kind of research is needed, because not much is being done to research the problems of the poor and find solutions that will help resolve their problems.

Moreover, adequately supported research of these institutions would provide an opportunity for the development and wide use of talent that otherwise may never have the opportunity to be discovered and used for the good of the Nation.

Let me state this point another way. The majority of the black college student population is still graduating from historically black colleges. Southern regional education board studies confirm that 69 percent of all black college graduates are the products of historically black schools.

My point is that high quality programs and opportunities should be provided where the students are.

This has not been the case at 1890 institutions because, to date, funds for research facilities, which they should automatically receive by virtue of their being land-grant institutions, have not come their way.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have not tried to go into detailed figures and data analyses that support our request for agricultural research. I think Dr. Ocleris Simpson is more adequately prepared to do this, and he has already made his report.

My plea to you is to look with favor upon our request and grant us your full cooperation in our effort to get this bill accepted and passed.

I thank you for permitting me to speak on behalf of this bill and the 1890 institutions. All of us know that we are dedicated people who deserve to have adequate research facilities at our universities for the good of the people of this country.

I should say a word or two about the previous discussion and the seeming dissatisfaction with the distribution of funds. I can understand this very well. When we started and sent out the survey to gather the material, not having been through this before and not being experienced in this kind of thing, some of the institutions might have taken it too lightly and not fully reported their needs,

but this is what they reported that their needs were and this is the basis from which Dr. Simpson worked.

I think we could have done a better job at Alabama A. & M. in identifying the needs, but I think we were sticking more specifically with what we thought we could get at the time and get it without asking for a great deal.

My own wishes would be to ask for $100 million, but we said that we had to be reasonable about this.

Let us make the point that these are the needs that were meant to bring us up. We made this point with USDA.

We know you are coming back with facilities for 1862's, but we do not want you to think for 1 minute that if we should happen to get the $50 million, that you would exclude us from 1862's facilities funds, because our purpose is to try to catch up.

Then, when you have some more funds, include us, since we were excluded from these funds from the beginning. We never got a penny of them.

I can understand and appreciate Virginia's point of view, Mr. Wampler. I think where Virginia made a mistake—and I do not blame them for trying to correct it—was that when the need assessment came about they were not a university. They did not have an agriculture department and they are now in the position of having both and they want some consideration. They have stated this.

I sympathize with them, but all of us made mistakes back there and probably did not ask for what we really need. I hope we can work it out.

Thank you.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. We have a quorum call on the floor. Mr. Halpin, do you think you could make your presentation in 5 minutes?

Mr. HALPIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have copies, and I could just paraphrase very briefly.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. HALPIN, DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE, STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN REGION; AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EXPERIMENT STATION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATIONAL POLICY, CLEMSON, S.C.

Mr. HALPIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chance to be before you today. I am James E. Halpin of Clemson, S.C. I appear before you today as executive vice chairman of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization Policy. I am making a statement to you on behalf of the chairman of ESCOP.

Agricultural research requires well-trained scientists, financial resources essential to program development, and facilities suitable for planned research to be accomplished. I am certain that the Congress was cognizant of this fact when, in the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, in section 1462, they instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a survey of the status and future needs of agriculture research facilities.

I believe that this survey has not yet been forwarded in final form to the Congress. I have read a rough draft of the information that has been collected, and it specifically shows that both the

colleges of 1890 and the State agriculture experiment stations have serious 90 facilities deficits in their column.

In closing, let me say that ESCOP supports the cause of 1890 as they seek to alleviate their facilities problems and be better prepared to properly support their research staffs.

I thank you for the time to speak.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much, sir. Without objection, your entire statement will be included in the record at this point.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Halpin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES E. HALPIN, EXECUTIVE VICE CHAIRMAN, EXPERIMENT STATION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

I am James E. Halpin of Clemson, South Carolina. I appear before you today as the Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP, the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy. My statement to you today will be on behalf of the Chairman of ESCOP. It is a pleasure for me to appear before you in support of the Colleges of 1890 relative to their needs for facilities.

Agricultural research requires well trained scientists, financial resources essential to program development, and facilities suitable for planned research to be accomplished. Inadequate facilities may result in inadequate research results. Without proper facilities, the high level of new technology our nation's agricultural needs and demands cannot be provided. If the federal government expects the Colleges of 1890 to develop and maintain an agricultural research program which is to contribute to our nation's future, agricultural growth and development, then the federal government best be prepared to recognize as an essential component of agricultural research.

The Congress of the United States provided specific language in the Food and Agicultural Act of 1977 relative to facilities. Section 1416 amended the Act of July 22, 1963 which provided authorization for facilities for the State Agricultural Experiment Stations whereby the Colleges of 1890 are now included in the provisions of that earlier legislation. Likewise, section 1416 provided specific levels of authorization for the funding of facilities for the State Agricultural Experiment Station and the Colleges of 1890.

To date, the administration has not recognized nor honored these Congressional authorizations.

Also, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 in Section 1462 instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to "conduct a comprehensive study of the status and future needs of agricultural research facilities". To date, I don't believe the final report of this study has been delivered to Congress. However, preliminary data made available to me indicates that in 1977 the following situation existed.

1977 RESEARCH PROGRAMS—SCIENTIST FACILITIES [1]

Agencies	Occupancy	Capacity	Shortage
State agricultural experiment stations	7,100.5	6,300.3	800.2
Colleges of 1890	180.6	75.4	105.2

[1] Figures represent Scientist Years (SY): Each SY = scientists including needed support personnel

It is obvious from the 1977 figures that both the State Agricultural Experiment Stations and the Colleges of 1890 need additional research facilities to effectively support their research scientists. Although some new space may have become available since 1977, I am confident that major space shortages still exist. Any expansion of these research programs in the future will add to the critical facilities problems even more.

ESCOP recognizes the need for suitable research facilities for agricultural scientists in all agencies and institutions engaged in agricultural research. We hope that Congress and the administration will study the data obtained in the facilities study when it becomes available and support the needs as shown.

ESCOP supports the Colleges of 1890 as they seek to alleviate their facilities problems and be better prepared to properly support their research staffs.

Thank you for permitting me to make this statement before you today.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. If you saw me smiling when Dr. Morrison was finishing his testimony, it was because it reminded me that in 1967 we had a hurricane in my area—Beulah. It did extensive damage.

I had a personal situation wherein after the Federal Government made the decision that $1,900 would be forgiven by the Small Business Administration for anyone that received a loan from SBA to repair their homes.

I had a very serious conversation with a gentleman who was accusing the Federal Government and myself, personally, of not being entirely fair to him because he had submitted a request and was granted a loan of $900 to repair what he could verify as damage to his home.

His very frank and sincere argument with me was that it was not fair to then go and forgive $1,900, that we should have told him before how much we would forgive. Therefore, he could have asked for more than the $900 he needed. I hope we do not get into that kind of a situation with respect to this legislation.

We thank all of you for being here.

Mr. Wampler, do you have any further statements?

Mr. WAMPLER. No; other than to thank all of the witnesses and to assure you of my sincere desire to reach some type of combination so that we can get this bill enacted into law. I do not want to be party to holding out false promises or to enacting legislation with no hope of getting the appropriation. I think, perhaps, Congress has done too much of that in the past.

I am confident, with reasonable men and women, that we can reach some type of accommodation here that will achieve the purpose of the bill and be a bill that has a chance of becoming law.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Thank you very much for being here.

Without objection the position statement by the agricultural faculty of Tennessee State University and the statement of Hon. Mickey Leland will be inserted in the record.

The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:21 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[The above referred to material follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. MICKEY LELAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to associate myself with the aims of H.R. 7557.

I would also like to commend the Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Texas, on his speedy action on this piece of vital legislation and pledge my wholehearted support of the Chairman's effort toward passage of this bill.

The Land Grant Colleges Program in the United States has been a tremendous success since its inception under the Act of 1862. The continuation of this program of equipment and land and for the planning, construction and renovation of facilities to enhance research capabilities in the field of agriculture is as essential today as it was over a century ago when this program was inaugurated by the 37th Congress.

I know that a study coordinated by the Association of Research Directors was started in 1976 to ascertain the needs of each of the participating institutions. I understand that special attention was given in the evaluation of needs to upgrade office and laboratory space, to eliminate the encroachment of current research activities on resident instruction and to further the development of research programs commensurate with the role of the 1890 institutions in participating with the 1862 institutions as partners to meet the agricultural research needs of their respective states. The study also dealt with the question of providing improved research expertise for enhancement of their resident instruction and extension programs. The data gathered during the course of this study were subjected to a computer

analysis to generate the specific dollar amounts needed to achieve the goals set out in the study.

Mr. Chairman, the extensive research done should be a great help in persuading our colleagues to vote for passage of this much needed legislation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the opportunity to voice my strong support of this bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Position Statement by the Agricultural Faculty of Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tenn.

The Agricultural Faculty of Tennessee State University fully support and enthusiastically endorse bill No. H.R. 7557 sponsored by the Honorable E de la Garza (D/Tex.).

Tennessee State University as well as other 1980 land-grant institutions have been limited in their capacity to conduct research both quantitatively and qualitatively due to the lack of facilities. Funds for research have been provided for 1980 institutions by Public Law 95-113, Section 1445. However, the lack of adequate facilities continues to hamper these institutions in fulfilling their mandates. The present bill before this subcommittee if enacted would provide critically needed funds to assist in the purchase of equipment, the construction of buildings and alterations and renovations of existing facilities that would enhance the capacity of 1980 institutions to engage in needed Food and Agricultural research.

The bill as it is presently written would require that States match the Federal funds awarded with an equivalent amount of non-federal funds. However, we feel that since State appropriations would be very limited due to the present money crunch the bill should require no more than 25 percent matching funds from the States.

The faculty also appreciates the invaluable efforts of Congressman E de la Garza in sponsoring this very important bill.

○

best copy available